

REGION 9 RAC 3 CB&I (Shaw) TASK ORDER EVALUATION

Contract No: EP-S9-13-02

Contractor: CB&I FEDERAL SERVICES, LLC  
1725 Duke Street, Suite 400  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Full Task Order Number: 018-RSBD-09GU Site Name: Anaconda Copper RI/FS OS

Approved **Current** Total Task Order **WORK PLAN BUDGET:** \$961,484.41

Evaluation Period of Performance: From: 05/01/2016 To: 10/31/2016

Task Order Awarded On: 03/21/14

TOPO/RPM Signature & Date: David Seter

Supervisor Signature & Date: Harold Ball

Project Officer Signature & Date: Maria Velez

Brief Description of Work Actually Performed During This Evaluation Period,  
(not a description of the purpose of the Task Order) - Required:

**Performance Category 1 QUALITY OF SERVICES DELIVERED:** The Contractor's  
demonstrated level of:

- Compliance with contract requirements, quality of performance delivered to the government, and overall technical expertise.
- Submission of accurate, complete and timely deliverables requiring little or no government correction.
- Management capabilities and management response to government technical direction.
- Knowledge of and adherence to current applicable guidelines, regulations, policies, laws, etc., as well as required certification(s) to perform required tasks.
- Providing appropriate, qualified personnel at proper pay levels, including, as appropriate for the position, personnel who understand EPA business methods and who require minimal or no training to perform the Task Order.
- Quality Assurance and Quality Control of Tasks.

Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Not Applicable
		7/31 9/26 6/6	9/1 6/27 (AVE)	11/1		

Supporting Comments:

(6/6) Good quality technical work product was delivered by contractor during this reporting period on work tasks: organizing work on OU-4 oversight; and OUI document review and preparation for technical stakeholder meetings. Poor quality narrative on invoice progress report which needed revision results in

dropping this category rating to fair

(6/27) There was only minor activity under this task order for this reporting period, including contractor follow-up on OU7 field observations and split sample date and preparation for upcoming OU4 field oversight. The monthly planning call and the summary of the work submitted with the invoice were of good quality as were the general services described above.

(9/1) Good quality technical work product was delivered by contractor during this reporting period on OU4 field oversight and OU1 document review and preparation for technical stakeholder meetings.

(9/26) Work this performance period included CB&I personnel J. McMillan and JC Isham attending the OU1 FS meeting in Reno on August 2 and preparation of informal meeting notes which were drafted and submitted to EPA on August 24. Minor LOE was spent by CB&I personnel K. OLeary to work on field notes for OU 4 for the oversight done on July 14 and 26. This performance was deemed fair in that CB&I's participation at the August 2 meeting was more limited than expected given the experience they have now accumulated at the site.

**Performance Category 2 EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT:** The Contractor's demonstrated level of:

- Ability to solve contractor and/or subcontractor performance problems, including Team Subcontractors, with minimal government assistance, and at no additional cost to the government, while keeping the government informed of relevant issues.
- Ability to implement Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) for issued Task Orders.

Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Not Applicable
	7/31 6/6	9/26 (AVE)	9/1 6/27	11/1		

Supporting Comments:

(6/6) Project work reported to be progressing, but daily field oversight reports for OU7 from March and April have not yet been submitted. Management does not appear to be successful in producing the deliverable. See also Timeliness of Performance.

(6/27) The contractor continued to perform a good job at organizing regular conference calls and other communications and has continued to provide levels of documentation that enable TOPOs to effectively review invoices.

(9/1) The contractor continued to perform a good job at organizing regular conference calls and other communications and has generally provided levels of documentation that enable TOPOs to effectively review invoices. Although, the fact that the contractor charges "lagging hours" for work performed greater than one month prior can make it more difficult for the TOPOs to conduct

(9/26) The contractor continued to perform a good job at organizing regular conference calls and other communications and has generally been available to support EPA at OU1 meetings but did not participate that fully at the August 2 meeting and has not been as effective at managing the end product of field oversight including the preparation of field notes for OU4 evaporation ponds field work performed in July. their review and requires follow up with the contractor.

**Performance Category 3 INITIATIVE IN MEETING CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS:** The Contractor's demonstrated level of:

- Initiative displayed to meet contract and Task Order requirements.
- Innovative methods utilized or recommended to investigate or solve technically complex or historical problems, or to assist EPA in dealing with recalcitrant parties.
- Commitment, if applicable, to "environmentally preferable" business practices, including "Clean up-Clean Air Initiative" and "green procurement".

Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Not Applicable
			7/31 9/1 9/26 6/27 11/1 6/6 (AVE)			

**Supporting Comments:**

(6/6) Contractor has generally shown good performance in meeting contract requirements although minor issues have arisen with invoices. Specifically, for this review period contractor made errors in the progress narrative including on OU1 which needed to be corrected and resubmitted.

(6/27) The contractor has done a good job at fulfilling contract requirements, submitting sufficiently detailed progress reports in support of invoices and supplementing this information as necessary at the request of the TOPOs. Burn rate has been lower than contractor's work plan budget estimates.

(9/1) The contractor has done a good job at fulfilling contract requirements, and generally submits sufficiently detailed progress reports in support of invoices and supplementing this information as necessary at the request of the TOPOs. Contractor has been readily available to discuss technical and administrative work on the project in support of progress reports and invoices.

(9/26) The contractor has done a good job at fulfilling contract requirements, submitting sufficiently detailed progress reports in support of invoices and supplementing this information as necessary at the request of the TOPOs. Burn rate has been lower than contractor's work plan budget estimates.

**Performance Category 4 TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:** The Contractor's demonstrated level of:

- Ability to develop and meet acceptable schedules to meet the Task Order's need.

Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Not Applicable

7/31 6/6		(AVE)	9/1 9/26 6/27	11/1		
-------------	--	-------	---------------------	------	--	--

Supporting Comments:

(6/6) OU7 Daily field oversight reports from March and April 2016 are yet to be submitted. Template submitted to EPA COR on 6/28/16 and approved 6/29/16 with instruction to submit remaining reports. Remaining reports have not been submitted to date.

(6/27) Contractor reports progress made on OU7 field oversight reports during this period, which adequately addresses delivery concerns expressed in previous monthly report.

(9/1) This review period the contractor did a good job meeting deliverable dates for OU4 field oversight and OU1 document review and preparation for technical stakeholder meetings.

(9/26) Contractor's attendance at the OU1 meeting was timely and the meeting notes were also timely, warranting a rating of good.

**Performance Category 5 COST CONTROL:** The Contractor's demonstrated level of:

- Control of overall Task Order costs, as well as the ability to keep costs reasonable and to stay within the Task Order's budget.
- Ability to track costs and provide accurate, complete, and timely tracking reports and submit current monthly invoices, which are defined as an invoice that contains charges that are not more than two (2) months old.

Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Not Applicable
			7/31 9/1 9/26 6/27 6/6 (AVE)	11/1		

Supporting comments:

(6/6) Actual cost control has been good as reflected in the burn rate being consistently lower than projected in the contractor's work plan budget.

(6/27) Burn rate has been lower than contractor's work plan budget estimates, although those initial estimates appeared on the high side to the TOPO. Contractor has been good at consulting with the TOPOs with respect to the minimum contractor staff needed to assist on conference calls, etc.

(9/1) Burn rate has generally been lower than contractor's work plan budget estimates, although this month's invoice was considerably higher due to the contractor's process of charging lagging hours as discussed above. This created more review complexity for the TOPO but overall the contractor is rated good at cost control.

(9/26) Burn rate has been lower than contractor's work plan budget estimates, although those initial estimates appeared on the high side to the TOPO. Contractor has been good at consulting with the TOPOs with respect to the minimum contractor staff needed to assist on conference calls, etc.

**Performance Category 6 BUSINESS PRACTICES:** The Contractor's demonstrated level of:

- Ability to effectively communicate and coordinate work while maintaining a positive working relationship with the government; seeking direction as appropriate yet performing work as independently as possible to achieve completion of the Task Order, keeping the government informed of progress as it occurs.

Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Not Applicable
		7/31 9/1 6/6	9/26 6/27 11/1 (AVE)			

Supporting comments:

(6/6) By failing to measure up to a "good" standard of performance in multiple categories this review period, contractor is rated "fair" under business practice.

(6/27) The contractor has continued to be responsive to TOPOs previous requests for more detailed information on progress reports. Burn rates are lower than budget estimates. A rating of "good" is warranted in recognition of the fact that the contractor has been responsive in addressing errors/delays but has experienced some errors/delays.

(9/1) The contractor has continued to be responsive to TOPOs previous requests for more detailed information on progress reports. Burn rates have generally been lower than budget estimates. A rating of "fair" is assigned due to the fact that this invoice period there were a significant number of hours charged as "lagging hours" creating more time and analysis for TOPO review and a much higher invoice amount this period.

(9/26) The contractor has continued to be responsive to TOPOs previous requests for more detailed information on progress reports. Burn rates are lower than budget estimates. A rating of "good" is warranted in recognition of the fact that the contractor has been responsive in addressing errors/delays but has experienced some errors/delays.

**Performance Category 7 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:** The Contractor's demonstrated level of:

- Overall achievement of the performance objectives of the Task Order, including budget, cost, schedule, etc.

Unsatisfactory	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Not Applicable
7/31 6/6	9/26	(AVE)	9/1 6/27	11/1		

Supporting comments:

(6/6) EPA is dissatisfied with Contractor's performance in preparing and submitting daily oversight reports for OU7 field work from March and April 2016.

(6/27) The contractor continues to perform good to excellent level work on a highly complex project with multiple stakeholders. A rating of "good" is assigned for this review period because EPA still awaits submittal of field oversight reports, although an explanation for the delay has been provided.

(9/1) The contractor continues to perform good work on a highly complex project with multiple stakeholders. A rating of "good" is assigned for this review period with that rating being assigned in all categories other than business practices, reflecting the one negative review comment by TOPOs for this invoice: that there were a significant number of hours charged as "lagging hours" creating more time and analysis for TOPO review and a much higher invoice amount this period.

(9/26) The contractor is assigned a rating of fair due to the fact that C&I personnel did not participate that fully at the August 2 meeting and has not been as effective at managing the end product of field oversight including the preparation of field notes for OU4 evaporation ponds field work performed in July.